DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 295 021 CE 050 212

TITLE Working toward Equity. A Report on Implementation of the Sex Equity Provisions of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act.
INSTITUTION National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education.
PUB DATE Apr 88
NOTE 39p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Compliance (Legal); *Displaced Homemakers; Educational Finance; Educational Legislation; Federal Legislation; Females; Mothers; *One Parent Family; Postsecondary Education; Program Implementation; Secondary Education; *Sex Fairness; *Vocational Education; *Womens Education
IDENTIFIERS *Carl D Perkins Vocational Education Act 1984

ABSTRACT

This report examines how the sex equity provisions of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act have been implemented in 16 states. It focuses on the implementation of the key provisions in the law that affect women and girls: the single parent and homemaker program (8.5 percent set-aside), and the sex equity program (3.5 percent set-aside). The provisions examined are as follows: (1) administration of the 8.5 percent and 3.5 percent set-aside funds; (2) distribution/allocation of the set-aside funds; (3) use of community-based organizations; and (4) support services. The report also includes specific examples of programs and practices that demonstrate positive uses of the set-aside funds and recommended legislative changes. The information in this report was collected by the Vocational Education Task Force from various sources including representatives from community colleges, secondary schools, community-based organizations, women's advocacy groups, sex equity coordinators, and state officials. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED295021

Working Toward Equity

A Report On Implementation Of The Sex Equity Provisions Of The Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Miller

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CE050212

ncwge

National Coalition For Women And Girls In Education
Vocational Education Task Force

April, 1988

THE NATIONAL COALITION FOR WOMEN AND GIRLS IN EDUCATION is a nonprofit organization of more than 60 organizations dedicated to working to improve educational opportunities and equality for women. Established in the late 1970's, the Coalition has been instrumental in working on: the Civil Rights Restoration Act, Women's Education Equity Act (WEEA), Equity in Women's Sports, and other areas involved in increasing educational opportunities for women.

The Coalition's VOCATIONAL EDUCATION TASK FORCE has a long history of working toward improving the quality of vocational services. Their contribution during the reauthorization of the Vocational Education Act in 1984 resulted in significant measures to increase the availability of innovative programs to women and girls. Many advancements have been made in the area of educational equity. However, much work remains to be done.

The National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education (NCWGE) expresses their appreciation to Wendy Adler of Wider Opportunities for Women for the extensive time and commitment she devoted to completing this project. Without her assistance in leadership, research and writing, the project could never have been completed. We also wish to thank Carolyn Eberle of 70,001 for her leadership of the Vocational Education Task Force during the development of this report, and Mary Monroe of the American Home Economics Association for her extensive work on the task force. Special thanks to JoAnn Thoms of Wider Opportunities for Women for her invaluable assistance in the production of this report.

TASK FORCE MEMBERS

Kathy Patrick, Chair
Vocational Education Task Force
Displaced Homemakers Network
202/628-6767

Jill Miller
Displaced Homemakers Network

Cynthia Marano
Wider Opportunities for Women

Deborah Arrindell
Wider Opportunities for Women

Shelly Gehshan
American Association of
University Women

Theresa Cusick
Project on Equal
Education Rights

Mary Stickles
Project on Equal
Education Rights

NATIONAL COALITION FOR WOMEN AND GIRLS IN EDUCATION

Jill Miller, Chair
1411 K Street N.W., Suite 930
Washington, D.C. 20005
202/628-6767

Working Toward Equity

A Report on Implementation of the Sex Equity Provisions of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act

Prepared by the Vocational Education Task Force of the
National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education
April, 1988

Table of Contents

I. Introduction.....1

II. Administration and Allocation of 3.5% and 8.5% Funds.....4

III. Community-Based Organizations.....14

IV. Support Services.....18

V. Legislative Recommendations.....20

VI. Appendices.....26 - 33

Appendix A - Background on Women and Vocational Education.....26

Appendix B - Provisions in the Law that Impact Women and Girls.....28

Appendix C - States Examined in the Report.....32

Appendix D - Vocational Education Allotments.....33

Introduction

The National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education represents over 60 diverse national organizations committed to expanding equity for girls and women in all aspects of education. The Coalition's Task Force on Vocational Education focuses on vocational education policy on the local, state and national levels as it pertains to women and girls. The passage of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act (Perkins) in 1984 represented a new federal policy commitment to provide improved vocational services to women. The Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act contains the largest set-aside provision in history of federal dollars for vocational training for women and girls.

It is clear that the set-aside provisions have had an enormous impact on vocational programming for women and girls. The set-asides have resulted in the development of new and/or expanded programs and strategies at both the secondary and post-secondary level. They have resulted in an increased awareness among students and teachers about sex stereotyping and have helped begin to open the doors for girls to consider a broad range of vocational options. They have also resulted in an influx of adult women into vocational programs by providing the counseling and support services that are necessary for returning adult women to succeed in vocational programs. The impact of the set-asides is reflected in the increase since the enactment of Perkins in the number of programs that are part of

the Displaced Homemakers Network -- up from 435 in 1984 to nearly 1,000 in 1987.

The National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education is committed to the set-aside provisions as an effective means of accomplishing the purpose of the Perkins Act: to increase access to vocational education among women and girls previously underserved. At the same time through the monitoring project, the Coalition found practices being used by some states that do not support the goals, spirit and intent of the Perkins Act. The information from the states collected as part of this study raises critical questions regarding whether the original intent of Perkins is being accomplished. There are also questions regarding whether the states are in compliance with the law.

This report examines how Perkins has been implemented in sixteen states. It focuses on the implementation of the key provisions in the law that affect women and girls:

- the single parent and homemaker program (8.5% set-aside) and;
- the sex equity program (3.5% set-aside).

Our research reveals that states have been operating with vastly different interpretations of the law. This results in two major areas of concern: whether states are actually in compliance with the requirements of the law; and whether the original intent of the law is being met by the states.

The provisions examined are as follows:

- Administration of the 8.5% and 3.5% set-aside funds.
- Distribution/allocation of the set-aside funds.
- Utilization of community-based organizations.
- Support services.

The report also includes:

- Specific examples of programs and practices that demonstrate positive uses of the set-aside funds.
- Recommended legislative changes.

The information included in this report was collected from various sources including representatives from community colleges, secondary schools, community-based organizations, women's advocacy groups, sex equity coordinators and state officials.

In order to preserve the confidentiality of those providing information, names of specific states are not always included.

Administration and Allocation of 3.5% and 8.5% Funds

The Perkins Act specifically assigns the sex equity coordinator the responsibility for "administering the program of vocational education for single parents and homemakers . . . and the sex equity program . . ." The legislative history indicates that Congress intended for the sex equity coordinator to have decision-making authority regarding the method of allocating the funds in the 8.5% and 3.5% set-asides and the programs that would be supported with these set-aside funds.

By definition, "to administer" is "to manage or supervise the execution, use, or conduct of." Our research reveals that many states have developed their own definition of "administer" which bears little resemblance to the literal one found in the dictionary or the one intended by Congress.

In practice, a sex equity coordinator's ability to administer is tied in part to a state's decisions on staffing and on how funds will be allocated within a state. The involvement of the sex equity coordinator in the decisions about in-state allocation and uses of the funds are key issues in determining whether the sex equity coordinator acts as an administrator of funds.

Administration

The Coalition found that the sex equity coordinator's administrative responsibility is often limited, constrained or circumvented in the following ways:

- o There are several states in which the sex equity coordinator has little or no administrative authority or responsibility for the set-aside funds and for the programs they support. Instead, states have delegated the administrative authority to other vocational education personnel.
  - For example, in Minnesota there are at least seven people who administer the set-aside funds. The Equal Employment Opportunity Manager administers some of the set-aside funds directly and supervises others who administer part of the funds. The sex equity coordinator administers only two-thirds of the 3.5% sex equity set-aside and has little or no control over the use of the remaining 3.5% and 8.5% funds. None of the other personnel are accountable to her.
  - In Georgia, the sex equity coordinator has no administrative authority over any of the set-aside funds. Her responsibilities are to conduct staff development and technical assistance in schools.
  - In Arkansas, the sex equity coordinator has no administrative authority over either set-aside at this time.

- Where the sex equity coordinator does have administrative authority over set-aside funds, in many cases he/she is hindered by guidelines or restrictions made at higher levels of the vocational or state education administration.
  - In two states, the sex equity coordinators were told that they could not contract with community-based organizations (CBOs) even though Perkins encourages the involvement of such organizations which have experience as well as proven effectiveness in serving the targeted populations. (See section on CBOs.)
  - In Indiana, significant restrictions were imposed the use of vocational education funds for the provision of support services, especially child care. (See section on support services.)
  - In New Jersey, because of a fiscal decision made by the state Department of Education, the sex equity coordinator was unable to fund programs at community colleges. Since most of the displaced homemaker programs in New Jersey were based at community colleges prior to the enactment of Perkins, the sex equity coordinator was compelled to generate other service providers. This caused a number of problems: the authority of the sex equity coordinator was undermined because she was prevented from using a reasonable range of options in deciding how to award funds; valuable

programs and services offered by community colleges were severely curtailed, and some programs were forced to close; and in many other areas there was unnecessary duplication of services.

- In New York, the sex equity coordinator, based upon her assessment of service providers, recommended that technical assistance manuals be developed for service providers with limited experience in serving single mothers, but was not allowed the funding to implement this plan.

o In a number of states, the set-asides are administered by two different individuals. One person (usually located in the agency responsible for secondary education) administers the 3.5% set-aside and another person (usually located in the agency responsible for post-secondary education) administers the 8.5% set-aside. While the person administering the 3.5% set-aside is usually designated the sex equity coordinator, that person has no authority over the administrator of the other set-aside. The person who has responsibility for the 8.5% set-aside does not report to the sex equity coordinator. The result is the person designated sex equity coordinator has administrative authority over only part of the set-aside funds. Pennsylvania is one state among many in which different people administer the set-asides and neither administrator

reports to the other.

- In many states, the sex equity coordinator retains responsibility for managing funds at the secondary level, but the responsibility for post-secondary funds is assigned to someone else, usually in a different department (one having jurisdiction over post-secondary education), who does not report to the coordinator. This is the case in Texas and California, among others. In this situation the coordinator is prevented from administering or monitoring the programs being supported with the set-aside funds.
- In many states, the sex equity coordinator has no decision-making authority regarding the manner in which set-aside funds are allocated--such as whether to use a request for proposal process or to allocate on a formula basis.
- Where states have made a decision to allocate funds on a formula basis, the sex equity coordinator often has little or no control over how the districts or institutions receiving funds will use them. In addition, coordinators often lack authority to require reports from recipients on the use of the funds.
- In large states where funds are allocated on a formula basis to hundreds of school districts and post-secondary institutions, sex equity coordinators have not been given additional staff support to administer and monitor the programs properly. For example, in Texas in 1986, funds

were allocated to 1,038 schools.

- Some sex equity coordinators report that even though they are supposed to administer funds, they in fact have been told to "sign off" on a grant or contract. In some instances, sex equity coordinators report that although they have signed contracts, they have not necessarily participated in making the decisions on how to allocate funds or which programs or schools would be funded. For example, in Louisiana the sex equity coordinator had determined which schools would receive funds and the amount they would receive. She later found that the State Director, in reviewing her determinations, decided to distribute the funds by formula allocation ignoring the sex equity coordinator's plan.

Allocation of Funds

The Perkins Act represents a major shift in the use of federal funds for vocational education. Because states over-match federal vocational funds by more than ten to one, Congress intended federal vocational funds to be used to correct problems of under-service to certain segments of the population and to be used for program improvement, not for the maintenance of traditional vocational programs. While the method of allocation is not specified by the Perkins Act, these dollars are intended to be used to stimulate expanded and improved programming for women and girls. However, states have demonstrated extreme

reluctance to adapt to new methods of allocating funds which differ from the formula allocation method in use before Perkins. One exception is Florida, which allocated most of its funds by formula in the first year that Perkins was in effect, but now distributes all funds though discretionary grants. The intent of the Perkins Act is being circumvented by the following practices related to the formula funding of the 8.5% and 3.5% set-asides:

- In states where formula-allocated funds go to hundreds of districts and institutions, the amount of funds received by some is often so small (in some cases as little as $1,200) that is not possible to implement special programming designed for women and girls.
- In states such as North Carolina, where the formula allocation method is used, there are often minimal or no requirements or expectations to structure programs or services appropriate to recruit and serve the target populations. A community college can simply receive funds and ask students at the end of the year, "How many of you are single parents or homemakers?" and then report that they have met the requirement of the set-aside.
- In states using the formula allocation method, educational institutions (community colleges, secondary, post-secondary or vocational schools) are frequently the only institutions included when computing formulas. As a result, community-based organizations and other private institutions have

limited opportunity to receive funding when this method is used.

These decisions regarding the method of allocation, the distribution of administrative authority, and the programs to be funded are made at various levels of the vocational education administration, often without any involvement of the sex equity coordinator. These restrictions or decisions hinder the sex equity coordinator's ability to ensure the development of programs that effectively serve women and work toward the elimination of sex bias and sex-role stereotyping as the law intends.

Innovative Programming

Despite some of the negative practices in the implementation of the Perkins Act, the single parent and homemaker and sex equity set-asides have resulted in some new and innovative programs.

Coordination

In several states vocational education agencies have coordinated with other state agencies to improve the provision of services to the target populations. For example:

- In New York, an interagency initiative serves AFDC mothers through the Department of Vocational Education and the Department of Social Services; and

- A Wisconsin program serving at-risk students including rape and incest victims, children of alcoholics, and teen parents, is coordinated between the Department of Public Instruction and the Department of Health and Social Services.
- In Massachusetts and Wisconsin, allocation of Perkins funds for displaced homemakers is coordinated with the allocation of state-legislated funds for the population, resulting in improved comprehensive programming. Massachusetts includes funds for single parents in the coordination process as well.

Non-traditional Training

A few states have encouraged women to enter non-traditional training programs.

- In Louisiana, women have been trained in commercial trucking, air-conditioning repair and auto-mechanics.
- California has been successful in encouraging Hispanic girls to enter non-traditional training.
- Georgia has developed effective recruitment strategies for non-traditional students.

Teen Parent Programs

- California has established a high school to serve the special needs of pregnant and parenting teens,

providing counseling, on-site child care and life-skills training among other services.

- A New York program encourages pregnant and parenting teens to finish school while providing them with marketable skills.

Training/Technical Assistance

States have attempted to provide various outlets to educate service providers in serving single parents, displaced homemakers and teen parents.

- School staff training has occurred in New York and Wisconsin, including workshops on updating curricula, assessing educational materials for sex bias and stereotyping and learning strategies to neutralize or eliminate sex bias in students' course selections.
- The sex equity coordinator in Wisconsin has developed a comprehensive curriculum for teen parents and is piloting a model for planning and assessing equity programs.
- In Florida and Illinois, set-aside funds are being used to provide comprehensive training and staff development to local training program personnel who provide vocational services to single parents and displaced homemakers.

Community-Based Organizations

The Perkins Act includes many references which promote the use of community-based organizations (CBOs). For example, states may use the single parent and homemakers set-aside funds to "make grants to community-based organizations for the provision of vocational education services to single parents and homemakers, taking into account the demonstrated performance of such an organization in terms of cost, the quality of training and the characteristics of the participants."

Although the law allows and encourages states to fund CBOs directly, and considers them legitimate service providers, it does not mandate funding of CBOs with the single parent and homemaker set-aside funds. Consequently, few states provide funding directly to CBOs but many permit education agencies to sub-contract with CBOs. Of the sixteen states surveyed, only three funded CBOs directly through their vocational education bureau. And even though direct contracting with CBOs is permitted in these three states, it is not a common practice. The decision not to fund CBOs directly or to allow sub-contracting only, can be due to a state policy, a decision by a vocational education administrator, or in a few cases by sex equity coordinators. In many cases, states have prohibited direct contracting with CBOs and allowed but not mandated sub-contracting. Even when sub-contracting is allowed, it rarely occurs in states.

This is the case in:

- Georgia, where no CBOs have sub-contracts;
- Louisiana, where approximately five CBOs received funds through sub-contracts;
- Texas, where no sub-contracting is occurring; and
- Two other states, one in which no CBOs have sub-contracts and the other in which four CBOs have sub-contracts. (These states requested anonymity.)

Further, even though state policy permits (but does not require) sub-contracting, few states have made a decision to promote sub-contracting with CBOs. Several sex equity coordinators believe that if they had not facilitated communication between the schools and CBOs, no sub-contracting would have occurred.

Other decisions and practices that have prevented or inhibited sub-contracting with CBOs include:

- Strict guidelines attached to funding create "red tape" which is so extensive that CBOs are effectively barred from participating as service providers;
- In large states where funds are distributed widely among many school districts, the grants received by schools are frequently so small that there is not enough money to provide funds to CBOs;
- Where CBOs have received funding, the grants are often so minimal that it is difficult to implement effective

programs;

- Once a CBO has received a contract, it often does not receive any funding until months after program start-up. As a result, the CBO must either go into debt or postpone providing services; and
- Where funds are distributed through a request-for-proposal (RFP) process, few states place CBOs on the list to receive notification of the availability of funds.

These actions limit the availability of quality service and keep the vocational education system closed to service providers outside the education system, even though private organizations may have the ability to serve best the needs and interests of single parents and homemakers or may already be providing these services in a community.

In most cases, we perceive this practice to be based solely on territorial issues and not based on the quality of training, characteristics of participants or costs as required by law.

When the system is closed, it damages only those who would otherwise receive training--those the Perkins Act was designed to assist. By opening up the system, coordination of existing resources is facilitated and quality services fostered. The difficulties of equipping single parents and homemakers with the tools necessary to become economically self-sufficient cannot be handled by only one agency or one system. It is too large and

complex a problem. By coordinating existing resources on the national, state and local levels, innovative approaches can be designed that address the numerous barriers these populations face.

Innovative Programming

The following examples demonstrate how Perkins can provide comprehensive education, employment and training services to economically disadvantaged women through the use of CBOs.

- Career Exploration Program--This program is run by a CBO in the State of Delaware. In addition to traditional training services, this program provides more intensive program services including:
  - -educational services;
  - -special counseling; and
  - -instruction in parenting skills, budgeting, self-image, and birth control.
- St. Francis Community Center--This CBO operates a single parent/displaced homemaker program in New Jersey. They work with single parents as well as women at risk of becoming single parents. The program provides outreach and recruitment services and helps them enter vocational training.

Support Services

The Perkins Act authorizes the use of funds from the 3.5% and 8.5% set-asides for support services, such as child care and transportation. It does not require the use of these funds for this purpose; although the lack of adequate support services often prevents women--particularly single parents--from participating in vocational and job training programs.

Most of the states we surveyed follow the federal guidelines and allow, but do not require, the use of vocational dollars for this purpose. However, the state Department of Education in Indiana places significant restrictions on the use of vocational education funds for support services. A contractor is prohibited from using 8.5% set-aside money to subsidize child care unless it also has been awarded a special grant to provide child care. Only five of fourteen programs in the state have such a grant. Other support services cannot be subsidized until a participant has completed 50 percent of her educational program. Georgia does not call for the use of Perkins funds for support services.

Some states have shown leadership in providing support services and have reported that they are critical to many women's successful participation in programs. North Carolina has used a portion of its sex equity funds to stimulate the development of on-site child care facilities in vocational education institutions. California guidelines say that support services "should be addressed" in requests for funding. Most states spend

their funds on child care, although a few states such as Louisiana and Oklahoma report using funds for transportation or tuition in addition to child care.

It is difficult to assess how well the states are meeting the need for support services. Although some states allow funds to be used for support services, this does not necessarily mean that funds are allocated for this purpose. Where funds are allocated, the amount spent usually does not meet actual needs due to the high cost of child care.

Legislative Recommendations

1. Reauthorize the provisions in the Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act setting aside no less than 3.5% of the basic state grant funds for sex equity programs and 8.5% for single-parent and homemaker programs.

Rationale: States have made exemplary use of Perkins funds to help women and girls obtain the skills needed to be productive in today's economy. As current and projected economic conditions mandate increased participation by women in the workforce, it is increasingly important that federal employment and training programs be designed to meet the their needs.

2. Require that the states distribute 8.5% and 3.5% set-aside funds on a request-for-proposal basis.

Rationale: We have found that when funds are allocated by formula some areas receive too few funds to use them effectively, and guidelines on how the funds should be used often are not issued or are not enforced. As a result, the intent of the law is not fulfilled. Distribution of funds through a request-for-proposal process would ensure that the recipients of the funds receive enough money to implement the intent of the set-asides. In addition, this process would promote greater accountability for the use of funds by grant recipients.

3. Require that a sex equity coordinator be appointed to administer both set-asides. The sex equity coordinator(s) should be required to develop an annual plan for the use of the set-aside funds based on the required needs assessment, manage the request-for-proposal process, distribute the funds, monitor progress and evaluate outcomes for both set-asides. To achieve this the law should, in the provisions for each set-aside, assign these specific responsibilities to the sex equity coordinator(s). These responsibilities should also be included in the list of sex equity coordinator functions listed in Title I of the Perkins Act.

Rationale: There has been much debate and confusion about what the term "administer" means with respect to the sex equity coordinators' responsibilities. The concept of administration must be clarified to ensure that quality services are delivered to the targeted population. The measures we suggest will accomplish this.

There is evidence that in some states sex equity coordinators are excluded from decision-making processes about funding. In addition, they have had significant portions of their responsibilities "delegated" to other staff without their approval and without being given supervisory authority over such staff. Sex equity coordinators are seldom given access to adequate support staff needed to carry out their administrative duties effectively. Such practices serve to circumvent the sex

equity coordinators' administrative authority and defeat the purpose of this portion of the Act.

4. Add language to the 3.5% and 8.5% set-aside provisions specifying that pre-vocational services and comprehensive support services be made available as needed to potential and current participants. Add clarifying language to the 8.5% set-aside provision to include dependent care as an allowable support service.

Rationale: Some states have taken the position that pre-vocational services and support services such as child care are not allowable under the Act unless an individual is already enrolled in a vocational education program. This prevents many women from entering a vocational education program because they cannot receive the services they need to enroll. Some states have even precluded such services until a program participant has completed part of a vocational program. In general, without pre-vocational and support services, many women are unable to participate at all.

Current language in the 8.5% set-aside provision allows for child care, but not adult dependant care--an important need for many mid-life and older women. The suggested language will correct this oversight.

5. Require the Department of Education to conduct biennial (once every two years) oversight visits specifically to examine the implementation of the sex equity provisions. Based on these findings, the Department of Education should provide technical assistance and/or take corrective action to address any violations. If necessary, the Department should fund appropriate personnel to accomplish this.

Rationale: Our sixteen-state research indicates that in many respects the intent of the law is not being fulfilled and little or no action is being taken to correct the discrepancies between the intent of the law and the practices within states. As a result, we believe that this provision is necessary to document violations and to ensure that corrective action is taken.

6. Require that the General Accounting Office conduct a study to determine whether states are complying with the assurance that special consideration be given to displaced homemakers and those with the greatest financial need when using funds allocated for single parents and homemakers.

Rationale: Little evidence was found to suggest that states give any special consideration to displaced homemakers and those most in need. A GAO study would identify those states that are not in compliance with the assurance.

7. Require that the sex equity coordinator develop data collection procedures appropriate to the target populations being served by the set-asides. The procedures should provide information about program services and outcomes as well as who is being served.

Rationale: This requirement will promote effective evaluation of both needs and services.

8. Strengthen the language in the 3.5% and 8.5% set-aside provisions to ensure that the services under these set-asides can be provided by community-based organizations that have demonstrated effectiveness in serving the targeted populations.

Rationale: This would eliminate the practice of states limiting or excluding community-based organizations from receiving set-aside funds. At the same time, it would help ensure that only those community-based organizations capable of effectively serving the targeted populations would receive funds.

9. Require that no portion of student financial aid received by a student be counted as income or resources in determining eligibility for any other assistance program funded in whole or in part by federal dollars.

Rationale: Under current law, the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) counts student financial aid administered through Perkins Title II-A as income in determining eligibility for food

stamps. In addition, FNS penalizes single parents who are less than full-time students by counting their supplemental child care and transportation monies against their food stamp allotment. The result is that financially disadvantaged single parents are forced to choose between a decrease in their food stamp allotment and attending their local community college. This is contrary to Perkins' stated purpose of bringing more women into the vocational education system.

Appendix A

Background on Women and Vocational Education

The passage of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act in 1984 represented a new federal policy commitment to provide improved vocational services to women. This legislation continues the trend toward sex equity in vocational education begun with the 1976 amendments to the Vocational Education Act of 1963. The law, which will be in effect until 1989, contains the largest set-aside in history of federal dollars for vocational training for women and girls.

While the Perkins Act represents a significant resource for increasing the potential for women's economic self-sufficiency, current implementation of the Act raises critical questions regarding its original intent. Because of the increase in women's poverty, this is of particular concern.

Of the more than 17 million students currently enrolled in vocational education programs, nearly half are women. Seven million of these students are in occupationally specific vocational programs. Despite some success in overcoming sex stereotyping, most women are still channelled into traditionally female programs which tend to lead to lower paying jobs.

Numerous studies, reports and evaluations have repeatedly documented that sex segregation exists in the vocational education system and that it has negative economic consequences

for women and girls. An examination of the types of occupational training in which women are involved reveals disturbing long-term labor market implications. In secondary vocational school programs, nearly 70% of the female students are enrolled in programs leading to jobs and occupations which pay below-average wages. In post-secondary and technical school programs the corresponding figures are 60 and 12 percent respectively. The failure of the vocational education system to be truly integrated has resulted by and large in the preparation of women and girls for occupations that pay the lowest wages and provide the fewest opportunities for advancement. In essence, a segment of the population is being trained for poverty or near-poverty. As a result, community-based organizations, women's employment advocates and others have, over a decade, fought to set into place program models and solutions to prepare women for higher-wage occupations.

But the tools to effectively incorporate or mainstream those solutions into the vocational education system have been either inadequate or totally lacking. Perkins provides some new tools and strengthens old tools for effecting systemic change to increase the economic self-sufficiency of women and girls who participate in the system.

Appendix B

Provisions in the Law that Impact Women and Girls

State Sex Equity Coordinator

The Perkins Act, under Title I-B, specifies that a person in each state is responsible for ensuring sex equity throughout the state vocational education system. The law prescribes that this person, who is generally referred to as the sex equity coordinator, shall work full time in the sex equity function, with control over two program areas: the single parent and homemaker program and the sex equity program.

The Perkins Act stipulates that the sex equity coordinator shall "assist the state board to fulfill the purposes of this Act" by "administering the program of vocational education for single parents and homemakers...and the sex equity program..."

The position also includes the following functions:

- Evaluating the effectiveness of programs in meeting the education and employment needs of women;
- Reviewing vocational education programs for sex stereotyping and sex bias;
- Reviewing action on grants, contracts and policies of the state board to assure that the needs of women are addressed as required in the Act;
- Developing recommendations for outreach programs for

women;

- o Providing technical assistance to local education agencies and others to expand vocational education opportunities for women; and
- o Assisting vocational education administrators, instructors and counselors in implementing programs to increase access for women (including displaced homemaker and single heads of households) to vocational education and to increase male and female students' enrollment in non-traditional programs.

The Single Parent and Homemaker Program

The Perkins Act, in Title II-A, authorizes 8.5% of the basic state vocational education grant to be used to support this new feature. This program, as specified in the law, requires that states use these funds for one or more of the following purposes:

1. Provide, subsidize or pay for vocational education programs to furnish single parents and homemakers with marketable skills (including basic literacy instruction);

2. Expand services to increase eligible recipients (agencies) who have the capacity to provide single parents and homemakers with marketable skills;

3. Make grants to community-based organizations to provide vocational education services to single parents and homemakers, if the community-based organization has demonstrated

effectiveness in providing similar services and is competitive with others in terms of cost, quality of training and characteristics of participants;

4. Provide for child care, transportation services, alternative program scheduling or other support services to increase access by single parents and homemakers to vocational education programs; and

5. Inform single parents and homemakers of available vocational education programs and support services.

The Sex Equity Program

Perkins, in Title II-A, authorizes a 3.5% set-aside of the grant to be used to eliminate sex bias and stereotyping and to increase sex equity in the vocational system. This program, like the single parent and homemaker program, is to be administered by the sex equity coordinator. Perkins requires that the state use the funds for the following purposes:

1. Programs to eliminate sex bias and stereotyping in secondary and post-secondary vocational education;

2. Vocational education programs for girls and women aged 14 through 25 to ensure economic self-sufficiency; and

3. Support services including dependent care and transportation.

Funds under this program may be used flexibly by states. States have used these funds to expand women's access to existing

programs, to design and implement new model programs and to stimulate women's interests in vocational education.

Appendix C

States Examined in the Report

Arkansas

California

Georgia

Indiana

Louisiana

Minnesota

New Jersey

New York

North Carolina

Oklahoma

Pennsylvania

Rhode Island

South Carolina

Texas

Virginia

Wisconsin

Appendix D

Vocational Education Allotments for Program Year 1988

(7/1/87 - 6/30/88)

STATES	STATES TOTALS	BASIC GRANTS
Arkansas	9,393,028	8,966,964
California	72,931,658	69,624,861
Georgia	23,399,848	22,344,851
Indiana	21,187,547	20,223,010
Louisiana	18,660,433	17,864,989
Minnesota	14,265,199	13,601,111
New Jersey	20,582,852	19,614,040
New York	53,862,470	51,361,537
North Carolina	25,661,668	24,499,881
Oklahoma	11,969,380	11,473,631
Pennsylvania	41,193,884	39,310,871
Rhode Island	4,204,068	4,038,399
South Carolina	14,403,460	13,755,208
Texas	56,651,005	54,279,483
Virginia	19,570,814	18,664,737
Wisconsin	17,548,807	16,745,524

National Coalition For Women And Girls In Education
Vocational Education Task Force

c/o

Displaced Homemakers Network
1411 K St., NW, Suite 930
Washington, D.C. 20005